

Remarks

With the addition of Claims 40-45, Claims 17-45 are presented herewith for consideration.

Claim 40 is identical to Claim 1 of issued Patent No. 5,823,782 ("the '782 Patent"), the parent of the present application, with the following exceptions: 1) issued Claim 1 recites "at least one visibly recognizable symbol" on the object, where New Claim 40 recites "at least one symbol"; 2) issued Claim 1 recites that the object-supporting surface and the processor are part of "an enclosure", where New Claim 40 recites the surface and the processor with no reference to an enclosure; and 3) issued Claim 1 recites that the processor is capable of identifying a position of the object on the surface, where New Claim 40 has no such recitation.

New Claims 41-43 are dependent on New Claim 40.

Claim 44 is identical to issued Claim 2 of the '782 Patent, with the following exceptions: 1) issued Claim 2 recites "a plurality of objects", where New Claim 44 recites "one or more objects"; and 2) issued Claim 2 recites that the computer is capable of providing "visible feedback", where New Claim 44 recites only that the computer is capable of providing "feedback".

Claim 45 is also identical to issued Claim 2 of the '782 Patent, with the following exceptions: 1) issued Claim 2 recites "a plurality of objects", where New Claim 45 recites "one or more objects"; 2) issued Claim 2 recites that the computer is capable of providing "visible feedback", where New Claim 45 recites only that the computer is capable of providing "feedback"; issued Claim 2 recites "a substantially flat, planar surface", where New Claim 45 recites only "a surface"; and issued Claim 2 merely recites "one or more detectors", where New Claim 45 recites "one or more detectors located beneath the surface".

The references cited during the prosecution of the '782 Patent have been studied. It is believed that each of New Claims 40-45 set forth above are patentable over the previously cited references at least for the same reasons as issued Claims 1 and 2. In particular, it is not believed that the changes presented in the new claims are critical to the patentability of the new claims over the previously cited references and it is believed that each of these new claims taken as a whole are patentable over the references cited against the issued '782 Patent.

It is therefore respectfully requested that New Claims 40-45, along with Claims 17-39, be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

April 9, 1999

By:

Brian I. Marcus
Brian I. Marcus
Reg. No. 34,511